Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/938,669	PETERSEN, JENS
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Carlos A. Azpuru	1615
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>Carlos A. Azpuru</u> .	(3) Victoira A. Silcott.	
(2) Stanislaus Aksman.	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>ちか</u> ねのち	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: 112, first paragraph, new matter		
Claims discussed: all		
Prior art documents discussed: N/A		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative Sig	anature – if appropriate)
The state of the s		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-413B (04-03) Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was suggested that applicant use the languae found in the original specification at page 9, lines 24-25 when referring to the empirical formula of the polyacrylamide of the invention. The language inserted into the claims is considered new matter since the specification makes no reference to a backbone at all. Applicant did not agree to these changes and applicant's representatives were notified that a rejection would be mailed.